Labor Divided in the Postwar European Welfare State

This book explains how the success of attempts to expand the boundaries of the postwar welfare state in the Netherlands and the United Kingdom depended on organized labor's willingness to support redistribution of risk and income among different groups of workers. By illuminating and explaining differences within and between labor union movements, it traces the historical origins of "inclusive" and "dual" welfare systems. In doing so, the book shows that labor unions either can have a profoundly conservative impact on the welfare state or can act as an impelling force for progressive welfare reform. Based on an extensive range of archive material, this book explores the institutional foundations of social solidarity.

Dennie Oude Nijhuis is assistant professor of history at Leiden University. He has been a visiting lecturer at Bilgi University, Istanbul University, and Chulalongkorn University and a research Fellow at Yale University's Department of Political Science. Oude Nijhuis specializes in the comparative political economy of labor markets and welfare states and the political economy of European integration. His work has been published in *World Politics, Labor History, Twentieth Century British History*, and the *Journal of Economic and Social Geography*. His thesis was shortlisted for the annual Dutch Political Science Association (NKWP) Dissertation Award. He has received an NWO-Rubicon grant for a research proposal that aimed to uncover the determinants of organized labor support for redistribution. In 2011 he was awarded the best article of the year prize on a non-U.S. or comparative topic by the journal *Labor History*.

Labor Divided in the Postwar European Welfare State

The Netherlands and the United Kingdom

DENNIE OUDE NIJHUIS

Leiden University



CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo, Delhi, Mexico City

Cambridge University Press 32 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10013-2473, USA

www.cambridge.org Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107035492

© Dennie Oude Nijhuis 2013

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2013

Printed in the United States of America

A catalog record for this publication is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication data Nijhuis, Dennie Oude, 1979– Labor divided in the postwar european welfare state: the Netherlands and the United Kingdom / Dennie Oude Nijhuis, Leiden University. pages cm Includes bibliographical references and index. ISBN 978-I-I07-03549-2 (hardback) I. Labor unions – Netherlands – History – 20th century. 2. Labor unions – Great Britain – History – 20th century. 3. Social security – Netherlands – History – 20th century. 4. Social security – Great Britain – History – 20th century. 5. Welfare state – Netherlands – History – 20th century. 6. Welfare state – Great Britain – History – 20th century. I. Title. HD6727.N517 2013 361.6'50949209045–dc23 2012049891

ISBN 978-1-107-03549-2 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party Internet Web sites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such Web sites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Contents

Lis	t of Tables and Figures	<i>page</i> vii
Pre	face	ix
Aci	knowledgments	xiii
Lis	t of Abbreviations	XV
A l	Note on Sources	xix
г.	Labor and the Development of the Postwar Welfare State	I
	<i>Revisiting the Role of Labor in Welfare State Development</i> <i>Union Structure and the Emergence of the Public and Private</i>	3
	Welfare State	10
	The Organization of This Book	15
2.	Labor Divided	19
	Revisiting British Voluntarism	27
	Shaping Solidarity: Union Structure and the Representation	
	of Workers' Interests	44
	Unions, Employers, and the Notion of the Social Wage	52
	Looking Ahead	62
3.	The Development of Old Age Pensions in the Netherlands	
	and the United Kingdom	63
	Solidarity versus Egalitarianism: Comparing Pension Reform	
	in the Netherlands and the United Kingdom	66
	Labor Unions and the Rejection of a Redistributive Contributory	
	Pension Scheme in the United Kingdom	73
	Unions, Employers, and the Move Toward Full Subsistence	
	Pensions in the Netherlands	87
	A Final Note on Employers	98

v

Cambridge University Press	
78-1-107-03549-2 - Labor Divided in the Postwar European Welfare State:	
The Netherlands and the United Kingdom	
Dennie Oude Nijhuis	
Frontmatter	
Aore information	

vi		Contents
4.	The Development of Unemployment Insurance in the	
	Netherlands and the United Kingdom	102
	Toward Superannuation for the Unemployed in the United Kingdon	1 105
	The Economic Benefits of Unemployment Compensation	108
	The Introduction of the Earnings-Related Supplementary Scheme	119
	From Bismarck to the Social Insurance in the Netherlands	125
	From Grant to Right: Introduction of the Unemployment Provision	136
5.	The Development of Disability Insurance in the Netherlands	
	and the United Kingdom	141
	The Trades Union Congress and the Industrial Preference	144
	The Evolution of Public Protection from Non-Work-Related	
	Disabilities in the United Kingdom	153
	Toward a Single Disability Insurance Program for All Disabled	
	People in the Netherlands	161
	The General Disability Act and Inclusion of the Self-Employed	174
6.	Union Solidarity and the Use of Social Security for Early	
	Retirement Purposes in the Netherlands	177
	Explaining the Extraordinary Exit of Elderly Workers from the	
	Dutch Labor Market	179
	The Dutch Disability Insurance Program and Exit from the	
	Labor Market	186
	Early Exit through the Dutch Unemployment System	196
	The Introduction of Industry-wide Early Retirement Schemes	202
7.	Conclusions and Implications	207
	Occupational Unionism and the Emergence of Divided	
	Welfare States	211
	Union Structure and Labor Market Development	217
	Mapping Social Solidarity	222
Bił	bliography	225
Inc		5
1110		243

Tables and Figures

TABLES

2.1.	Dispersion of Weekly Earnings of Full-Time Male Manual	
	Workers in the United Kingdom, 1886–1982	page 41
4.1.	The Unemployment Benefit as a Percentage of Weekly	
-	Earnings under the National Insurance Scheme in 1965	123
4.2.	The Unemployment Benefit as a Percentage of Weekly	
-	Earnings under the National Insurance Scheme and the	
	Earnings-Related Supplementary Scheme	124
5.1.	Weekly Benefit Level of a Fully Disabled Male Worker in	
5	Shillings, 1959	148
5.2.	Benefit as a Percentage of Previous Earnings under Labour's	
5	Sick Pay Proposal and the Existing National Insurance Scheme	
	(NI) during the First Four Weeks of Sickness or Disability	157
5.3.	Benefit as a Percentage of Previous Earnings under Labour's	5,
	Sick Pay Proposal and the Industrial Injury (II) Benefit during	
	the First Four Weeks of Sickness or Disability	158
5.4.	Public Insurance Against Disability in the Netherlands in the	-
	Early Postwar Period	163
6.1.	Composition of the Labor Force of Older Men in Various	-
	Countries, 1989	180
6.2.	The Use of Different Early Retirement Pathways among	
	Male Workers in the Netherlands, 1980–1992, by Number	
	of Participants as a Percentage of the Age Groups Fifty-Five	
	to Fifty-Nine and Sixty to Sixty-Four	185

vii

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-03549-2 - Labor Divided in the Postwar European Welfare State:
The Netherlands and the United Kingdom
Dennie Oude Nijhuis
Frontmatter
More information

viii Ta	ables and Figures
FIGURES	
6.1. Labor Force Participation Rate of Men Aged Fifty-Five	
to Sixty-Four in Various Countries (in percent)	179
6.2. Disability Benefit Recipients per 1,000 Active Labor Man	rket

Participants by Age in Various Countries in 1990 187

Preface

The first decades after World War II undoubtedly presented a crucial epoch in the development of the modern welfare state. Within a time span of only a few decades, all industrialized countries succeeded in creating intricate systems of social protection that raised many of their citizens out of poverty, significantly reduced market-generated income disparities, and greatly diminished the financial consequences of labor market risks such as unemployment, sickness, disability, and old age. In the immediate postwar period, the bulk of the population living in the industrialized world relied on grossly inadequate levels of protection against hardships resulting from labor market risks. Some thirty years later, many industrialized countries had succeeded in creating cradle-tograve protection against such hardships for them. The consequences of this for the state's role in society and the improvement it brought to citizens' daily lives were truly astounding.

Yet, crucially, these improvements were by no means shared equally in all parts of the industrialized world. While all industrialized countries experienced sharp increases in both public and private social expenditure in the decades following World War II, they differed markedly in the overall level of this increase, the division within what is popularly known as the "public and private mix," and the degree to which national programs came to contain redistributive features. As a result, they came to differ greatly in their ability to protect their members against the risk of economic misfortune. Most important, they came to differ greatly in their ability to protect their members. This difference, while grounded in the first decades of the postwar period, has persisted in subsequent years. The countries that created the most solidaristic welfare states in the first postwar decades still provide the most inclusive and redistributive insurance programs. Conversely, the countries that created dual systems of private and public insurance, under which the

х

Cambridge University Press 978-1-107-03549-2 - Labor Divided in the Postwar European Welfare State: The Netherlands and the United Kingdom Dennie Oude Nijhuis Frontmatter <u>More information</u>

Preface

most affluent enjoyed the highest levels of security while the less affluent often lacked proper insurance, have maintained this duality up to the present day.

This book results from the conviction that we cannot improve our understanding of postwar welfare state development in different countries, and their widely diverging trajectories, without a fundamental reappraisal of organized labor's involvement in the creation and expansion of social policies during the crucial first decades of the postwar period. In some ways this reappraisal seems long overdue. For more than a decade now, traditional labor-centered accounts of the welfare state have been subjected to severe criticism from what can be broadly described as employer-oriented writings. The main purpose of this literature has been to show that employer interest groups have often played a more important, and a more cooperative, role in the development of social policies than previously realized. Yet their strong condemnation of the prominent role attributed to class divisions in much of the literature has obvious consequences for our understanding of organized labor's involvement in the coming about of progressive welfare reform as well. Recent work on welfare state retrenchment, by pointing to left divisions, has similarly provided findings that give good cause to reconsider organized labor's role in the creation and expansion of the welfare state.

So far, and as will be explained at length in Chapter I of this book, this much-needed reconsideration has failed to materialize, though. In much of the literature on welfare state development, including nearly all recent writings on the role of employers, labor unions continue to be viewed as natural supporters of the welfare state – including its redistributive consequences. Instances of labor union support for progressive welfare state reform are still generally understood as a logical outcome of workers' interest in obtaining security against labor market risks. Instances of union opposition to the creation and expansion of social insurance programs, if recognized at all, continue to be explained through "voluntarist" notions that emphasize union suspicions of state motives and their fear that increased state intervention might affect their future ability to attract workers.

This treatment of organized labor, I have come to believe, does not do justice to the very diverse and often conflicting nature of workers' demands for security against labor market risks. Nor does it sit well with the fact that the welfare state is mainly about redistributing risk and income between different categories of workers rather than between "capital" and "labor" or "rich" and "poor." This book emphasizes that labor unions, depending on their internal organizational blueprint, value these redistributive consequences in strikingly different ways. My central argument is that the internal organizational structure of labor unions has therefore been of major, and neglected, importance for the success of progressive welfare reform in the first decades of the postwar period.

In recent years, much of the most exciting research on welfare state development has come from a scholarship that has sought to emphasize organized

Preface

employers' contribution to welfare state development. This book instead lends support to traditional labor-oriented writings by emphasizing organized labor's central role in the coming about of progressive welfare reform. This is not to say that employers have not been influential. The book merely emphasizes the proactive role of labor unions in voicing demands for improved protection for workers against labor market risks and converting these demands into concrete welfare initiatives. In addition, and far more important, it shows that organized employers' responses to demands for increases in public protection against labor market risks depended greatly on organized labor's willingness and ability to support redistribution of risk and income among different categories of workers.

To illustrate my claims, I chose to compare the postwar welfare trajectories of the Netherlands and the United Kingdom. These countries not only provided ideally divergent institutional contexts, but their welfare trajectories are also strongly at odds with conventional (class-oriented) explanations of postwar welfare state development. Perhaps partly as a result of this, both countries are also relatively understudied by comparativists. The goal of this book is therefore not only to revisit our view of organized labor's involvement in the development of the postwar welfare state but also to offer a detailed and alternative history of the coming about of progressive welfare reform, or lack thereof, in the Netherlands and the United Kingdom. Some readers may have doubts about the generalizability of my findings to countries other than the Netherlands and the United Kingdom. For them I have included numerous references to and expositions on other European countries as well as the United States.

In a world where political actors go to great lengths to mask internal divisions, and where strategic behavior often conceals true preferences, establishing social causality can be a difficult task. Uncovering these divisions and real preferences required many months of archive research. These archival forays first opened my eyes to the strong degree to which labor unions, and to some extent also employer interest groups, are driven by normative orientations that emphasize fairness and/or solidarity with weaker group members. By neglecting this and focusing almost completely on rational self-interests, the existing literature has failed to capture a major force behind the success – or failure – of redistributive welfare state development. Partly as a result of this, such terms as "solidarity" and "egalitarianism" are used with frustrating inadequacy. I can only hope that my treatment of these terms is sufficiently precise to offer a conceptual improvement.

xi

Acknowledgments

Writing this book has been a difficult, protracted, and at times daunting task. I am therefore fortunate to have been able to benefit from the support of many friends, colleagues, and institutions. Generous funding from Leiden University's History Department and the Leiden University Fund have enabled me to do research for and write this book. A generous grant from the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research helped me to revise it. I had the opportunity to do most of the revisions to this book while working as a guest researcher at Yale University's Department of Political Science, which provided an extraordinarily stimulating environment for this endeavor.

During my numerous archival ventures, I received generous and patient assistance from archivists at the National Archives in London, the Modern Records Centre in Coventry, the International Institute of Social History, the National Archives of the Netherlands (Nationaal Archief), the Confederation of Netherlands Industry and Employers (VNO-NCW), the Radboud University Nijmegen's Catholic Documentation Center (Katholiek Documentatiecentrum), the VU University Amsterdam's Historic Documentation Center of Dutch Protestantism (Historisch Documentatiecentrum voor het Nederlands protestantisme), and the Dutch Social Security Agency (Uitvoeringsinstituut Werknemersverzekeringen). The archivists include Frank Kanhai, Lodewijk Winkeler, Piet Hazenbosch, Hans Seijlhouwer, Teun van Lier, and Caroll Lewis.

Academically, I am foremost indebted to Richard Griffiths, who has been my mentor from the first day I walked into his undergraduate lecture up to the present day. I am also grateful to Jeroen Touwen, who not only encouraged me to venture into academics but also proved to be a great source of support and friendly advice in subsequent years. Sharing an interest in economics and labor-related matters, our many discussions broadened my horizon. My greatest thanks go to Peter Swenson, whose work on labor markets and welfare states has reoriented comparative political economy research during the past

xiii

xiv

Acknowledgments

decade. I am extremely grateful for his enthusiastic support for this book and many comments. Moreover, his commitment to critical research and nonconformism continue to inspire me.

At every stage of the writing process, friends and colleagues have offered countless suggestions, comments, and advice. For their assistance and comments, I gratefully thank Ben Gales, Peer Vries, Thomas Lindblad, Matthieu Leimgruber, Peter Scholliers, Lex Heerma van Voss, Kees van Kersbergen, Jelle Visser, Karen Anderson, Ruud Koole, Leo Lucassen, Doreen Arnoldus, Noel Whiteside, Jacques van Gerwen, Daan Marks, Martijn van der Burg, Hannah Sarvasy, Tom van der Meer, Cátia Antunes, Martijn van der Burg, and Ismail Hakkı Kaddı. At Cambridge University Press, I am grateful to Lew Bateman and Shaun Vigil for their expert guidance.

Last but not least, I want to thank my wife, Ayben. I am grateful to Ayben for continuing to believe in this project and for supporting me even when I left everything else aside to work on this book. It is to her that I dedicate this book.

Abbreviations

THE UNITED KINGDOM

AAS	Association of Approved Societies
AEEU	Amalgamated Engineering and Electrical Union
BEC	British Employers' Confederation
CAWU	Clerical and Administrative Workers' Unions
CBI	Confederation of British Industry
CPSA	Civil and Public Services Association
EETPU	Electrical, Electronic, Telecommunications and Plumbing Union
FBI	Federation of British Industries
GMWU	General and Municipal Workers' Union
ISTC	Iron and Steel Trades Confederation
LOA	Life Offices' Association
NALGO	National Association of Local Government Officers
NEDC	National Economic Development Council
NEDO	National Economic Development Office
NFPW	National Federation of Professional Workers
NJAC	National Joint Advisory Council
NUM	National Union of Mineworkers
NUPE	National Union of Public Employees
NUR	National Union of Railwaymen
NUS	National Union of Seamen
NUVB	National Union of Vehicle Builders
PEP	Political and Economic Planning
RMT	National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers
SERPS	State Earnings-Related Pension Scheme
STOP	Save the Occupational Pension
TGWU	Transport and General Workers' Union
	-

xv

xvi	Abbreviations
TSSA TUC	Transport Salaried Staffs' Association Trades Union Congress
THE NETH	ERLANDS
AAW AKWV	Algemene Arbeidsongeschiktheidswet (General Disability Act) Algemene Katholieke Werkgeversvereniging (General Catholic
AOW	Employers' Federation) Algemene Ouderdomswet (General Old Age Act) Christelijk Nationaal Valenak and (Christian Union Federation)
CNV CSWV	Christelijk Nationaal Vakverbond (Christian Union Federation) Centraal Sociaal Werkgevers Verbond (Central Social Employers' Federation)
FCWV	Federatie van Katholieke en Protestants-Christelijke Werkgeversverbonden (Federation of Catholic and
FNV	Protestant-Christian Employers' Unions) Federatie Nederlandse Vakbeweging (Federation Dutch Labor Movement)
FvB	Federatie van Bedrijfsverenigingen (Federation of Industrial Councils)
GMD	Gemeenschappelijke Medische Dienst (Common Medical Service)
KAB	Katholieke Arbeidersbeweging (Catholic Workers Movement)
KVP	Katholieke Volkspartij (Catholic People's Party)
KVW	Katholiek Verbond van Werkgeversvakverenigingen (Catholic Federation of Employers' Unions)
MHP	Vakcentrale voor Middelbaar en Hoger Personeel (Federation for Middle and Higher Level Personnel)
NCW	Nederlands Christelijk Werkgeversverbond (Christian Employers' Federation)
NKV	Nederlands Katholiek Vakverbond (Netherlands Catholic Trade Union Federation)
NVV	Nederlands Verbond van Vakverenigingen (Dutch Association of Trade Unions)
PvdA	Partij van de Arbeid (Labor Party)
RKWV	Rooms-Katholiek Werkliedenverbond (Roman Catholic Workers' Federation)
RvBA	Raad van Bestuur in Arbeidszaken (Council of Directors in Labor Affairs)
RVV	Raad van Vakcentralen (Council of Trade Union Federations)
SER	Sociaal-Economische Raad (Social-Economic Council)
SVR	Sociale Verzekeringsraad (Social Insurance Council)
VNO	Verbond van Nederlandse Ondernemingen (Federation of Dutch Industries)

Abbreviations

xvii

VPCW	Verbond van Protestantsch-Christelijke Werkgevers in	
	Nederland (Federation of Protestant-Christian Employers)	
VUT	Vervroegde Uittreding (Early Retirement)	
WAO	Wet op Arbeidsongeschiktheidsverzekering (Act on Disability	
	Insurance)	
WW	Werkloosheidswet (Unemployment Act)	
WWV	Wet Werkloosheidsvoorziening (Unemployment Provision Act)	

THE UNITED STATES

AFL	American Federation of Labor
CIO	Congress of Industrial Organizations

SWEDEN

ATP	Allmän Tilläggspension
LO	Landsorganisationen i Sverige
SAF	Svenska Arbetsgivareföreningen

A Note on Sources

The comparison of the Netherlands and the United Kingdom in this book draws on a variety of secondary and primary sources. The use of the latter demands some clarification. The search for primary sources to support my argument sent me to both sides of the North Sea. Most valuable for this research were the minutes of various committees of the major union (con)federations in the two countries. In the United Kingdom, these minutes came from the Trades Union Congress (TUC). In the Netherlands, these union federations were (in order of influence) the socialist Dutch Association of Trade Unions¹ (Nederlands Verbond van Vakverenigingen, henceforth NVV); the Catholic Workers Movement (Katholieke Arbeidersbeweging, henceforth KAB); its successor, the Netherlands Catholic Trade Union Federation (Nederlands Katholiek Vakverbond, henceforth NKV); and the protestant Christian Union Federation (Christelijk Nationaal Vakverbond, henceforth CNV). When important decisions in the field of welfare were to be made, the social security experts and leadership of these federations often met in the Council of Trade Union Federations (Raad van Vakcentralen, henceforth RVV).

Both because one of the purposes of this work is to show how union structure matters to the involvement of employer interest groups in welfare state

¹ The English translations of these Dutch organizations are mostly taken from William van Voorden, "Employers Associations in the Netherlands." In John P. Windmuller and Alan Gladstone, *Employers Associations and Industrial Relations: A Comparative Study* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985); and Joris van Ruysseveldt and Jelle Visser, *Industrial Relations in Europe: Traditions and Transitions* (London: Sage, 1996). On some occasions these authors used different translations. While Van Voorden, for example, writes of the Federation of Dutch Industries to describe the VNO, Van Ruysseveldt and Visser use the name Federation of Dutch Enterprises. On such occasions I have allowed myself some academic freedom in choosing one or the other. Similarly, the Sociaal-Economische Raad (SER) is sometimes translated as Socio-Economic Council, Social and Economic Council, and Social-Economic Council. In this case, I have opted for the last. Finally, the Vakcentrale voor Middelbaar en Hoger Personeel has been previously translated as Federation of White-Collar Staff Organizations, the Dutch Trade Union Confederation for Middle and Higher Employees, the Federation of Managerial and Professional Staff Unions, and in many other ways. In this case, I have chosen to use the name Federation for Middle and Higher Level Personnel because this seemed closest to its original meaning.

xix

XX

A Note on Sources

development and because the records of such groups also provided valuable information on the actions of unions, this work also draws heavily on the minutes of various committee and board meetings of important employer federations. In the United Kingdom, these federations were the Federation of British Industries (FBI), the British Employers' Confederation (BEC), and their predecessor, the Confederation of British Industry (CBI). In the Netherlands, there were so many employer federations that it would take too much space here to list them exhaustively. Of most importance for this research were the minutes of the liberal Central Social Employers' Federation (Centraal Sociaal Werkgevers Verbond, henceforth CSWV) and those of its successor, the Federation of Dutch Industries (Verbond van Nederlandse Ondernemingen, henceforth VNO). Of slightly less importance were the minutes of the Catholic Federation of Employers' Unions (Katholiek Verbond van Werkgeversvakverenigingen, henceforth KVW) and the General Catholic Employers' Federation (Algemene Katholieke Werkgeversvereniging, henceforth AKWV), the Federation of Protestant-Christian Employers in the Netherlands (Verbond van Protestantsch-Christelijke Werkgevers in Nederland, henceforth VPCW), and the general-confessional Federation of Catholic and Protestant-Christian Employers' Unions (Federatie van Katholieke en Werkgeversverbonden, Protestants-Christelijke henceforth FCWV) and Christian Employers' Federation (Nederlands Christelijk Werkgeversverbond, henceforth NCW). As was the case with their union counterparts, the social security experts and leadership of these various employer federations often held meetings in a common platform, called the Council of Directors in Labor Affairs (Raad van Bestuur in Arbeidszaken, or RvBA).

Other primary sources also proved useful. The research on the United Kingdom relies on various government records found in the Public Record Office. Of particular importance were minutes of meetings and correspondence from officials of the Ministry of Pensions and National Insurance, the Department of Health and Social Security, and departments that were responsible for labor and unemployment matters. For the discussion on superannuation in the United Kingdom, I also used records from the Life Offices' Associations (LOA), the main representative of the British insurance industry. Finally, I used several publications issued by various Labour governments, employer federations, and individual unions. For the research on the Netherlands, I interviewed several social security experts and leaders from important unions and used records from the Ministry of Social Affairs. For the discussion on the use of social security programs for early retirement purposes in the Netherlands in Chapter 7, I made extensive use of archives from organizations responsible for the implementation of these programs, including the Common Medical Service (Gemeenschappelijke Medische Dienst, or GMD), the Federation of Industrial Councils (Federatie van Bedrijfsverenigingen, or FvB), and the Social Insurance Council (Sociale Verzekeringsraad, or SVR). When I did my research, these were located at the headquarters of the Dutch Social Security Agency (Uitvoeringsinstituut Werknemersverzekering). Recently, they have been moved to the National Archives of the Netherlands.